REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-23 and 25-27 are pending in the current application and these claims currently stand rejected. Claims 1, 9 and 19 have been amended herein to more clearly define the scope of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims and remarks presented herein overcome the Examiner's rejections in the Office Action dated May 28, 2008.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-23 and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Yuan (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,704) in view of Perkins ("IP Mobility Support for IPV4, RFC3344, IETF, August 2002) and in further view of Magret (U.S. Patent No. 6,856,624). Additionally, Claims 19-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 as being unpatentable over Yuan in view of Perkins in view of Magret and further in view of Kumar et al (U.S. Patent No. 7,985,279). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

First and foremost, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims have been amended herein to further clarify the claimed invention. Specifically, as amended, the claims now include the elements of a mobile node that issues a first DHCP request, registers with the address of the first home agent it receives from the first DHCP server, examines the address to determine whether it is on an internal network or an external network, and upon roaming to a second network, attempts to register again with the first home agent, upon failure to register, issues a second DHCP request to a second DHCP server on the second network and registers with the address of the second home agent provided by the second DHCP server.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Yuan with Perkins and/or Magret simply does not teach each and every element of the claimed invention. The Examiner suggests that Yuan discloses all elements of independent Claims 1, 10 and 19 with the exception of the following elements: "extensions with the registration reply that identify the HA as part of an internal network or an external network and an extension as an internal registration reply extension or an external registration reply extension",

"examining the registration reply to identify an extension" and "determining if the mobile node/system is on an internal network or an external network". The Examiner suggests, however, that Perkins teaches the first element while Magret teaches the remaining two elements. Applicants strongly disagree.

With respect to Yuan, Applicants respectfully submit that Yuan does not teach or suggest various elements claimed herein. The Examiner submits that Applicants previously submitted argument directed to this issue failed because the features upon which Applicants relied are not recited in the claims. Thus, although claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. Applicants respectfully resubmit the previously submitted arguments in light of the amendments to the claims herein. For the Examiner's convenience, the claims are reiterated below.

Regardless of what is taught by Yuan (and Applicants respectfully submit that it does not teach each and every element listed above by the Examiner), Yuan simply cannot be combined with either Perkins or Magret in the manner suggested by the Examiner. The Examiner erroneously contends that Perkins teaches the first element of "examining a registration reply from the first home agent to identify an extension, wherein the extension includes an internal registration reply extension or an external registration reply extension provided by the home agent". The Examiner points to Perkins sections 3.4, Page 33, Page 34 and sections 3.5.2, 3.5.3, 3.5.4, Page 37-38 as teaching this element, but Applicants strongly disagree. These sections of Perkins merely describe the various extensions defined by IPV4, ("The fixed portion of the Registration Reply is followed by one or more of the Extensions"), Perkins Page 34. In other words, Perkins appears to merely describe the "Dual HA" prior art solution articulated in the Specification, Paragraph 15 and 16:

> "The presence of VPN Gateway 225 introduces a layer of complexity when MN 140 attempts to roam between Corporate Intranet 100 and External Network 205. One proposed solution to address the roaming problems that arise in this scenario is described in "Mobile IPv4 Traversal Across IPsec-Based VPN Gateways," Internet Draft draft-ietf-mobileip-vpn-problem-solution-02.txt (Work In Progress), December 2002 (hereafter "Dual HA Solution"). According to the Dual HA Solution, MN 140 may register with two home agents when the MN roams on External Network 205 and wants to access resources inside Corporate Intranet 100 while maintaining its current transport session...

> The Dual HA Solution described above presumes that MN 140 knows various configuration details, e.g., the addresses for HAi 300, HAx 305 and VPN Gateway 225. The solution also assumes that MN 140 is roaming within a single network served by VPN Gateway 225 and that all these configuration details are static. MN 140 may in fact roam from a first network (e.g., Network A) to a different network (e.g., "Network B") having a new VPN gateway.... There is currently no methodology by which MN 140 may dynamically identify a home agent" (emphasis added)

If Perkins roams within a single network served by the VPN gateway, then it simply cannot teach or suggest the element claimed herein which makes sense only in a roaming environment wherein the mobile node moves from one network to another network, served by a second DHCP server and a different VPN Gateway. Instead, Perkins describes the dual HA solution, which runs into problems under certain scenarios and as described in the Specification in Paragraph 17:

> "MN 140 may be configured with a set of static information pertaining to its default internal and external home agents, and a default VPN gateway address. While roaming, however, this static information may be overridden by updated information obtained dynamically according to embodiments of the present invention. More specifically, while roaming, MN 140 may request and obtain a COA from a DHCP server. According to one embodiment, the DHCP server may also provide MN 140 with a home agent address. MN 140 may attempt to register with this home agent address, and based on information received from registration reply extensions, determine dynamically whether it is on Corporate Network 100 or External Network 205. MN 140 may then utilize additional information received in the registration reply extension to complete registration with the appropriate home agent, if necessary."

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in Perkins describes dynamically determining whether the mobile node is on an internal or external network. Perkins additionally does not describe or suggest issuing a second DHCP request to a second DHCP server upon roaming from a first network to a different network having a second DHCP server and a new VPN gateway. The Examiner's addition of Magret to Yuan and Perkins does not overcome this problem, i.e., the combination still does not teach or suggest these claim elements. Since the combination of these references does not teach or suggest the independent claims, by extension, they also does not teach or suggest the pending dependent claims herein. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection to pending Claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-23 and 25-27.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome and that pending Claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-23 and 25-27 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance in this case. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (714) 730-8225.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 28 , 2008

/Sharmini N. Green, Reg. No. 41,410/
Sharmini N. Green
Senior Attorney
Intel Corporation
Registration No. 41,410
(714) 730-8225